

REMARKS

Claims 1–20 were previously pending in this application. Claims 12 and 19 are amended. No claims are canceled or added. Claims 1–20 remain pending.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1–7 and 10–20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,085 B1 issued to Gershman et al. (hereinafter “Gershman”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant stands by the responses contained in the response to the previous Office Action (dated 01/05/2005) wherein Applicant contended that (1) Gershman does not disclose or anticipate the use of a profile-based schema; and (2) Gershman does not disclose or anticipate a logical profile document that is used in conjunction with a content document of profile information.

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method for use in a computer network. The method includes steps of: (1) “providing a profile schema, the profile schema having profile-related fields arranged into a content document with defined structures for the field;” (2) “receiving a data access request directed to profile information, the request including associated identity information;” and (3) “in response to the data access request, manipulating at least one set of data in a logical profile document that includes data therein according to the associated identity information, each set of data in the logical profile document structured to correspond to a field in the content document of profile information.”

Clearly, claim 1 requires a profile schema arranged into a content document with defined structures for the fields (see element (1) above). The Specification of the present application defines the term “schema” as:

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response

Application Number: 10/021,291

Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01

Filed: 10/22/2001

a set of rules that define how a data structure may be organized, e.g., what elements are supported, in what order they appear, how many times they appear, and so on. In addition, a schema may define, via color-coding or other identification mechanisms, what portions of an XML document (that corresponds to the data structure) may be operated on. Examples of such XML-based documents are described below. The schema may also define how the structure of the XML document may be extended to include elements not expressly mentioned in the schema.

Specification, page 11, lines 12-21.

In support of its assertion that Gershman teaches the first element of claim 1, the Office Action recites col. 40, lines 10-14 and col. 40, line 55 – col. 41, line 7 of Gershman. Applicant contends that the entire Gershman reference does not stand for element (1) of claim 1 and that, specifically, these excerpts do not teach this element.

Applicant notes that Gershman refers to “parsing” content “looking for instances of events, contact names and email addresses.” (Gershman, col. 40, line 55 – col. 41, line 7). Applicant contends that the term parsing implies that the content is not arranged according to a schema. If the content were arranged according to a schema (as recited in claim 1), then parsing the content wouldn’t be necessary since each item of data would be in a known location which could be directly accessed.

Gershman merely discloses a database of detailed personal information in records. Such a database is well known in the art and does not comprise a schema as defined in the present application or as the term is used in the art.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites a “logical profile document” and a “content document of profile information.” Gershman does not disclose

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response

Application Number: 10/021,291

Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01

Filed: 10/22/2001

such elements, particularly with the relation between the two described in the present application.

One cited section of Gershman teaches content retrieved from the web that is filtered using profile records and arranged in a web page, not a logical profile document.

Another cited excerpt from Gershman teaches arranging product statistics in a web document for providing *a consumer report* about a product, not a logical profile document with each set of data in the logical profile document structured to correspond to a field in the content document.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Gershman and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 4 recites a computer-implemented method for use in a computer network. The method includes steps of: (1) "receiving a request to retrieve profile data, the request including associated identity information;" (2) "reading from a data store to obtain profile data based on the associated identity information;" (3) "constructing a profile document including at least part of the data, the document arranged according to a defined schema for profile data;" and (4) "returning the document in response to the request."

Generally, it is noted that claim 4, like claim 1, requires that a profile document be arranged according to a defined schema. As previously discussed, Gershman does not disclose or anticipate the use of a schema.

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response

Application Number: 10/021,291

Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01

Filed: 10/22/2001

Claim 4 also requires receiving a request to retrieve profile data associated with identity information and obtaining profile data based on the associated identity information. Claim 4 also requires constructing a profile document to a defined schema from the retrieved data. Gershman merely teaches returning a web page containing product or other information about a product such as a consumer report.

Equating a client request for product information with a client request for profile data arranged in a schema-related document is erroneous and should be reconsidered by the Office.

Gershman does not disclose or anticipate each and every element as recited in claim 4. Accordingly, claim 4 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 and 10-18 depend from claim 4 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for: (1) "receiving a request to retrieve profile data, the request including associated identity information;" (2) "reading from a data store to obtain profile data based on the associated identity information;" (3) "constructing a profile document including at least part of the data, the document arranged according to a defined schema for profile data;" and (4) "returning the profile document in response to the request."

It is noted that claim 19 includes similar elements as claim 4, discussed above. By the same rationale included in the response to the rejection of claim 4, claim 19 is allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response

Application Number: 10/021,291

Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01

Filed: 10/22/2001

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly the rejection of claim 20 should also be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,349,290 to Horowitz et al. (hereinafter "Horowitz"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 8 depends from claim 4 and is allowable over Gershman for the same reasons stated above in the response to the rejection of claim 4. Horowitz does not disclose or anticipate any subject matter which makes up for the deficiencies pointed out in said response. Therefore, claim 8 is allowable over the cited references, standing alone or taken together, and the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,480 to Conmy et al. (hereinafter "Conmy"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 9 depends from claim 4 and is allowable over Gershman for the same reasons stated above in the response to the rejection of claim 4. Conmy does not disclose or anticipate any subject matter which makes up for the deficiencies pointed out in said response. Therefore, claim 9 is allowable over the cited references, standing alone or taken together, and the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response

Application Number: 10/021,291

Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01

Filed: 10/22/2001

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response

Application Number: 10/021,291

Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01

Filed: 10/22/2001

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 19, 2006

By: 

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No.: 37,773  
Attorney for Applicant  
Direct telephone (425) 705-3539  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION  
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 19, 2006  
Date

  
Signature

Noemi Tovar  
Printed Name

Type of Response: Amendment/Final Response  
Application Number: 10/021,291  
Attorney Docket Number: 190463.01  
Filed: 10/22/2001